

REMARKS

The Official Action of February 22, 2005, and the prior art cited and relied upon therein have been carefully studied. The claims in the application are now claims 9-13, and these claims define patentable subject matter warranting their allowance. Favorable reconsideration and such allowance are respectfully urged.

Claims 1-8 have been canceled, and new claims 9-13 added. Claims 9-13 remain in the application for consideration.

In response to the Examiner's rejection of claims 1-8 under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph, Applicant has canceled claims 1-8 in favor of new claims 9-13 which have been drafted to eliminate the problems identified by the Examiner. Applicant respectfully submits that this rejection has now been overcome.

The Examiner has further rejected claims 1-3 and 6-8 under 35 U.S.C. §102 (b or e) as being anticipated by U.S. Patent Publication 2003/0150565; hereafter Gonzaga.

Gonzaga clearly fails to teach:

(1) An arm that is rotatable in a swivel plane perpendicular to a vertical wheel support surface,

(2) A cylinder piston unit connecting a base to a central portion of the arm, and

(3) a locking and release system which is slidable in a curved slot fixed to the base,

all of which structural features are set out in new independent claim 9.

Absent these structural features, it is clear that Gonzaga cannot function in the same manner as the claimed invention, and that the claimed invention patentably defines over Gonzaga.

Applicant further notes that the prior device is a part of a demounting machine that is intended to withdraw the tire bead from the rim. This device is intended to release a bead firmly attached to the bead retention flange of the rim. This operation requires a significant force (1.500 kg) and must occur before the wheel is put on the demounting machine to be subjected to the action of the prior art device, followed by the action of the demounting tool. The claimed invention does not operate in the same manner.

Acknowledgement by the PTO of the receipt of applicants' papers filed under Section 119 is noted.

The prior art documents made of record and not relied upon have been noted along with the implication that

Appln. No. 10/702,451
Amdt. dated June 22, 2005
Reply to Office Action of February 22, 2005

such documents are deemed by the PTO to be insufficiently
pertinent to warrant their applications against any of
applicant's claims.

Favorable reconsideration and allowance are
earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,

BROWDY AND NEIMARK, P.L.L.C.
Attorneys for Applicant(s)

By 
Norman J. Latker
Registration No. 19,963

NJL:ma
Telephone No.: (202) 628-5197
Facsimile No.: (202) 737-3528
G:\BN\C\Corr\Corghil8\pto\Amendment-A.doc